

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-26 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26 are sought to be amended in response to the current Office Action and are discussed below. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26 can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0032], [0042], and [0043] of the originally filed specification. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The current Office Action states on page 4 that claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-19, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,483,932 B1 to Martinez *et al.* (hereinafter, “Martinez”) in view of U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2003/0123714 A1 to O’Gorman *et al.* (hereinafter, “O’Gorman”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26 recite features that distinguish over the applied references. For example, claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26 recite, using respective language, calculation of a blending depth to determine a number of pixels to be blended.

For example, the blending depth (the size of the blending region) can be calculated to minimize final “stitched” image distortion, as discussed in the instant application. Also, for example, the blending depth can be much smaller than the “slice” overlapping region.

Neither Martinez nor O’Gorman, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this distinguishing feature. Martinez has no teaching or suggestion at all for this distinguishing feature. Even assuming O’Gorman is the closest reference with regard to blending, O’Gorman does not calculate a blending depth and has no control over the size of the blending region, as recited in the independent claims. Rather, the size of the blending region in O’Gorman appears to be determined by the overlap itself.

For at least this reason, claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26, and the claims that depend therefrom (including claims 2-6, 9-11, 15-19, and 22-24) should be found patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-19, 21-24, and 26 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The current Office Action also states on page 9 that claims 7, 12, 20, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Martinez in view of O’Gorman, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,864,296 to Eric L. Upton (hereinafter, “Upton”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Upton is not used to teach or suggest the distinguishing feature discussed above, nor does Upton teach or suggest the distinguishing feature. Therefore, Upton does not cure the deficiencies of Martinez and O’Gorman, as described above with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 21, and 26. Claims 7, 12, 20, and 25 depend from claims 1, 8, 14, and 21, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the reason(s) that claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 are patentable, in addition to their respective recited features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7, 12, 20, and 25 be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.


for Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 8/16/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

709569_1.DOC